IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
AT JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

O R D E R

S.B. CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION NO. 1102/2006
ABDUL MAZID Vs. THE STATE OF RAJASTHAN & ORS.

Date of order: 08.01.2007.

HON'BLE MR. K.S. RATHORE, J.

Mr. Gajendra Singh Katela for the petitioner.
Mr. B.N. Sandu, PP for the State.

****

This revision petition under Section 397 read with Section 401 Cr.P.C. is directed against the judgment dated 20.06.2006 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge (Fast Track), Karauli in Sessions Case No. 17/2005, by which the accused-non-petitioner No.2 Gopal has been acquitted from the offences under Section 332, 333 IPC and Section 32/33 of the Forest Act and non-petitioner No.3 Charat has been acquitted from the offences under Section 32/33 of the Forest Act.

Brief facts of the case are that on 17.12.2004 on the basis of the report submitted by the complainant-petitioner at Police Station Karanpur, District Karauli, FIR No. 70/2004 was registered against the accused-non-petitioner Nos. 2 and 3 for the offence under Sections 332 and 353 IPC. After investigation police submitted charge-sheet against the

accused-non-petitioners before the competent Court and charges were framed against the accused-non-petitioner No.2 under Sections 332, 333 IPC and Section 32/33 of the Forest Act and against accused-non-petitioner No.3 under Section 32/33 of the Forest Act.

The trial Court after considering the evidence recorded and the material available on record, has given the benefit of doubt and acquitted the accused-non-petitioners from the aforesaid offences.

Upon careful perusal of the impugned judgment dated 20.06.2006 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge (Fast Track), Karauli, it appears that the prosecution has utterly failed to prove the offence committed by the accused-non-petitioners and, therefore, the benefit of doubt has been given by the trial Court.

Having gone through the impugned judgment as well as the record of the case, I find no illegality or error in the impugned judgment of acquittal dated 20.06.2006, which requires any interference by this Court.

Consequently, the revision petition fails and the same is hereby dismissed.

(K.S. RATHORE),J.

/KKC/

(3